

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/693,517	CROWL ET AL.
	Examiner Tuan A. Vu	Art Unit 2193

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Tuan A. Vu. (3) _____.
 (2) Fred Mollborn. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 27 April 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative has been approached for an agreed upon effort to put all distinguishing features of the invention in the main claims. In doing this, Examiner suggested needs for more specifics to a feature called 'instances' to really impart it to a compiler context for program source like C++ regarding which the claim has to put forth the instances so that they are made available in the libraries in conjunction with the linking process operating with linker table names representing these instances. It was agreed that all of these would be reflected in Examiner's amendments so that the invention would be better condition for an allowance, pending some minor corrections which Examiner would timely convey to the representative..